

Budget Office has estimated that lawmakers would still tap the Social Security surplus by anywhere from \$13 billion to \$20 billion. Republicans may have to resort to an across-the-board spending cut of 1 to 2 percent to keep from doing that."

Now, let me get into that, if I could a little bit, Madam Speaker, because that is basically what we were hearing from the other side of the aisle tonight. They know they have spent this \$13 to \$20 billion of the Social Security surplus. They will not admit it, but it is a fact. It is in the Congressional Budget Office analysis. Everyone knows it. So now they are talking about this 1 percent. I think it was 1.4 percent, but now they are talking 1 percent, so I guess they revised it, that they are trying to say they are going to implement as a way of getting around spending the Social Security surplus.

Well, this is really just an admission of the fact that they have been caught red-handed dipping into the Social Security surplus. They are looking scrambling around to make up the difference with gimmicks and these across-the-board spending cuts. This plan to require a 1 percent automatic budget cut, if the Office of Management and Budget certifies that spending would dip into Social Security, is really an admission by the chairman of the House Committee on the Budget, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KASICH), that Republicans have stuck their hands deep into the Social Security cookie jar. It is basically asking the Administration to save House Republicans from themselves.

One of the other things that they did, which I thought was particularly interesting, was this idea to raid the tax refunds of the working poor. Every day we get a different gimmick. It is either emergencies, delayed spending, 1 percent across-the-board, and the one a couple of weeks ago was this idea of taking the earned income tax from the working poor and using that. Actually, their proposal would have delayed \$7 billion worth of earned income tax payments to the working poor in order to fill the gaps in the budget.

I do not know what they were thinking with that. Maybe that somehow the working poor, because they figured they do not have time to vote or do not have time to read the newspaper or something, that they were not going to notice that they did not receive their tax refund up front. I do not even know if they have dropped that. That may still be out there as another way or another gimmick of trying to somehow hoodwink the American people as to what they are really up to.

Let me just say, though, because I have heard this 1 percent plan mentioned several times this evening by my Republican colleagues who spoke before me, that even that does not add up. They are pretending a 1 percent across-the-board cut will do the trick and erase their \$12 or \$13 billion spending where they have dipped into the

Social Security surplus. But even with that, they are still nearly \$4 billion in the hole based on their own phony accounting. In reality, I say they are way on their way of dipping into even more and more of the Social Security surplus.

As we see what develops over the next few days or the next few weeks here, I am sure we will all find that, in fact, they are spending even more, and they are going to go way beyond that \$12 or \$13 billion that has already been spent from the Social Security surplus and even spend more before they finally wrap up this budget process.

Madam Speaker, I do not intend to spend a lot more time this evening, but I feel it is my obligation and that of my colleagues on the Democratic side to come here every night and basically present the truth and expose this GOP hypocrisy on Social Security. I have never seen an effort by my Republican colleagues to basically come to the floor every night and somehow think that if they are going to keep saying this over and over again, that the President is dipping into Social Security or the Democrats want to dip into Social Security, that somehow it is going to be believed.

They are even running these ads, very expensive ads, I should say, in a lot of the districts of my Democratic colleagues, accusing my Democratic colleagues of dipping into Social Security. I think the theory is if they tell the lie often enough that people will believe it; or if they spend enough money getting the message out, even though it is not true, people will believe it. I hope the people do not believe it. And certainly we will continue on this side of the aisle to expose the truth about what is really going on here and how much money is already being spent by the Republicans with their spending bills.

The ultimate irony is that they keep coming and talking about how the President wants to keep spending money. Well, the President does not appropriate the funds. They are in the majority. The Republicans are in the majority in both the House of Representatives and in the Senate. They are in the majority. They send him the bills. If he vetoes the bills, the money is not spent. That is the constitutional process.

So for the life of me I do not understand how any of them can suggest that by the President vetoing a bill that somehow he is spending the Social Security surplus, when all he is saying is that the money cannot be spent. If he vetoes the bill, the money is not spent. The only way the money is spent is if they appropriate the money and he signs the bill.

So the whole process, the whole way they go about describing the process, is basically not true. And I think it is incumbent upon myself and others to come here every night and to explain what is really going on here in this Republican effort and their inability to

adopt a budget that does anything but spend the Social Security surplus.

ILLEGAL NARCOTICS AND ITS EFFECTS ON THE YOUTH OF OUR NATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. NORTHUP). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MICA) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. MICA. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to come to the floor of the House again on a Tuesday night to talk about an issue that I talk about as often as possible, and that is the problem that we have in our country and also in dealing in Congress with the issue of illegal narcotics and the tremendous impact that illegal narcotics are having on our young people.

Tonight I am going to focus a little bit on some of the issues that relate to the question of the District of Columbia's appropriation and some specific measures that are in the appropriations bill that deal with the District of Columbia.

I also intend to talk a bit about the general war on drugs and review a little bit how we got ourselves into that situation.

Time permitting, Madam Speaker, I also hope to talk some about Colombia and the administration's potential request, which certainly will dramatically affect our spending as soon as we finish with the problems we have now in funding the fiscal year 1999-2000 requirements. We are expecting a rather substantial request to come in by the administration, and we will talk about that and Colombia and how we got ourselves into that particular dilemma.

And I will also talk a bit about the situation in Panama, that whole region that has been such an active area as far as illegal narcotics trafficking and disruption in general for the entire hemisphere.

So those are a few subjects, and then, time permitting, I will get into some of the updates that I usually try to do on problems relating to illegal narcotics and how they affect all our communities across the land.

The first thing that I want to talk about tonight is something that I hear repeatedly over and over; that the war on drugs has failed; that, indeed, we have lost the war on drugs. I have some very good friends, even on the conservative side, and I noticed one of the columnists, who is very conservative in his opinion, this past week came out and said why not legalize narcotics; that the war on drugs is a failure. I always try to relate my topic of discussion to the facts and deal with the facts and statistics, information that we have had presented to us in the subcommittee which I chair, which is the Subcommittee on Criminal Justice, Drug Policy and Human Resources of the Committee on Government Reform.

We have had many, many hearings since I have taken that subcommittee

over the beginning of the year dealing with illegal narcotics, and we have looked at the question of whether or not the war on drugs is indeed a failure. We have looked at the question of legalization. In fact, we probably conducted the first hearing, the only hearing to date, on the question of legalization and decriminalization of drug penalties. We have talked in our subcommittee and held hearings on the problems with Mexico, with Colombia, with some of our treatment programs and, most recently, the education program that this Congress has funded to the tune of a billion dollars over the next 5 years getting an update on that first year's progress in that program.

□ 1945

Additionally, the southwest border and the billions of dollars we spent in Federal resources at that border in trying to contain not only illegal narcotics but illegal immigration and trafficking, illegal commerce across our borders.

So we have covered the gamut of this topic. We have heard from GAO, DEA, Department of Justice, Department of Defense, Department of State, many, many agencies of Federal Government and rely on their facts and support and statistics in our reports.

Basically, I came to the conclusion, and I think my colleagues would too if they spent time in those hearings as we have done, we came to the conclusion that, in fact, the war on drugs did not fail.

What happened was we had an end of the war on drugs in 1993 with the Clinton administration, which took over not only the executive branch of Government, which executes the law, but also had very substantial majorities in both the House of Representatives and also the other body, the United States Senate. They controlled and dominated the agenda, the legislative agenda, and the executive and administrative operations of this Government for over 2 years, from 1993 through 1995.

I have had these charts out before, and I will refer to them once again. Foremost in our responsibility as a Federal Government are our programs to stop illegal narcotics at their source, outside the country. Now, State and local governments law enforcement folks cannot do that, but it certainly must be done. And whether we legalize what are now illegal narcotics or not, we would still have a fundamental responsibility in keeping what would be an illegal commodity coming into the United States. In this case, it happens to be primarily heroin, cocaine, and methamphetamines.

The first thing that the Clinton administration did after completely decimating the drug czar's office, and that was the beginning of the ending of the war on drugs, they took the drug czar's office down from a staffing level of over 120 to some less than 2 dozen personnel. That was the first cut, slash, burn that ended the war on drugs.

The next thing they did, and again Federal responsibility is to stop drugs at their source, that is, outside the boundaries of the country, clearly a Federal responsibility, if you look at the chart, Federal spending and international programs, these are source country programs we see this dramatic decline in 1993 right in this period here through 1995, up to 1996 it bottomed out. This is where the Republicans took control of the House and the other body.

Then you see a dramatic reversal in that spending. And these are really not very big dollars, this is \$633 million, in the scheme of our entire war on drugs. And you have to understand that illegal narcotics and drug abuse and crime and operating our justice system and everything, all the costs run us about a quarter of a trillion dollars a year.

So this is \$633 million back in 1991. And in 1999 we are up to about that level. If you look at 1990 dollars, you see that we have gotten us back into the war on drugs in the source country programs. And that has been particularly effective in cocaine, where we have had two programs that the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HASTERT) help start them, Mr. Zeff, formerly a member, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HASTERT) now the Speaker, when they took over this responsibility which I now chair, they began very effective international programs in both Peru and Bolivia.

I am pleased to say that, in Peru, almost 60 percent of the cocaine production has been eliminated and in Bolivia over 50 percent. President Fujimori of Peru has done an outstanding job. And the President of Bolivia has done an excellent job, too. Mr. Banzer, the President there, has, as I said, eliminated over almost half the production and has a program that in the next 2 years, 24 months, to eliminate the balance.

So we have seen cocaine production figures drop most cost effectively, small amounts of money, in those countries.

The one disaster in all of this is Colombia, and I will talk about that later, where specific administration policy closed down not only the war on drugs internationally but, more specifically, in Colombia. And that has done the most damage and where we are getting now most the cocaine and heroin entering the United States is now produced there.

But we see, in fact, our primary responsibility as a Federal Government would be in the international arena spending cost effectively these dollars, and in 2 to 3 years they did an incredible amount of damage.

The next responsibility as far as the Federal Government and working with our agencies to stop illegal narcotics would be to stop them from the source to the border coming into the United States. Again, the war on drugs basically closed down.

If we took these figures back to when Ronald Reagan was President and

George Bush, we would see a dramatic drop and they made tremendous progress in stopping illegal narcotics coming in, stopping the production and also interdicting and using the resources of our various agencies.

Basically, again, the Clinton administration and the Democrat controlled Congress stopped the military from being involved in the war on drugs. And some way, well, the military should be involved in this effort. But, in fact, they do patrol outside our borders. In fact, their planes do go up every day. In fact, we have servicemen and women serving around the world.

If we looked at the impact of any type of damage to our country, I said a quarter of a trillion dollars in expenditures and lost lives and production in this effort, our military are there, they are on duty. And they were brought into this war by President Reagan and also there with the blessing of President Bush, and they did a tremendous job and we saw a decline in illegal narcotics coming into the country. And it was most cost effective since we are paying the tab for the military in these arenas anyway.

Additionally, if you took at the casualties, and I have cited the most casualties we had released just a few months ago, it was over 15,200 Americans died from drug-induced deaths, if you take from the time President Clinton was elected to today, we are probably looking at close to 80,000 Americans have died as a result of drug induced deaths. And that is as many as any of the conflicts, the Vietnam conflict, the Korean conflict. And that does not address the other social problems, the human tragedy cost to so many who are not mentioned in just the death figures but the destruction again of families.

Again, the second most important responsibility, stopping drugs before they come into our country, very cost effective again. We were up to \$2 billion totally. And again this is money that would have been spent by the military in any event, almost all of this money. Because we have the planes, we have the ships, we have the personnel which are the bulk of the costs. But, again, their disdain for the military, their disdain for a real war on drugs, they took them out of this effort.

We also used the Coast Guard to protect our borders, particularly around the coastal areas. Puerto Rico is a great example. And my area has been very hard hit. I represent central Florida, Orlando, where our heroin overdoses and drug overdoses now exceed homicide as a cause of death, more deadly than any gun or knife or weapon that is used in the destruction of human life.

Drugs have decimated my area. Most of those drugs came in from a very simple action of the Clinton administration in cutting the Coast Guard budget. This House of Representatives and the Senate, dominated by the Democrats in 1993, 1994 up to 1995, slashed those budgets. Talk to anyone who is in the Coast

Guard. They cut the shield that protected Puerto Rico. And drugs float in there. Once they are in Puerto Rico, they are in the United States. And the next thing we knew, they were flooding our area and Central Florida, and other areas have been hit by the same type of heroin epidemic.

But there are consequences to our policy. The policy adopted by this Congress is very clear. They killed the war on drugs, dead as a doornail. So we had again no leadership as far as the national level. In fact, we had contraleadership with the appointment of Joslyn Elders, who was our Nation's number one health advocate, and she said "just say maybe."

They slashed the drug czar's office from 120 positions down to some 20 positions. They cut the spending in the Federal areas of most critical importance. Again, source country, very cost effectively. Just a few dollars took the military of the Coast Guard and others out of this war.

So, my colleagues, that is how we got ourselves into this situation, with incredible quantities of heroin coming into the United States, incredible quantities of cocaine, methamphetamines, and other drugs coming into the United States, cheap and on our streets in large quantities.

Now, those policies had some very direct results. I wish I could take a transparency and put what they did as far as their policy over these next charts. These charts, and I showed them, one other time we have used them, but they show the long-term trend and lifetime prevalence of drug use.

If we look again, this puts it in perspective. I hope we can focus on this. If we look at the Reagan years and we see the prevalence of drug use in the Reagan years starting to decline, the Bush years declining dramatically, the Clinton years almost like a rocket it is launched from the time that Bill Clinton, with the help, assistance and aided and abetted by the House of Representatives, did what I cited in these two charts and gave us this result.

And it is dramatic, if you look at just in the short time the Republicans took control of the House and the Senate, how we have already begun to turn that tide. And that is through restoring interdiction, through bringing the military back into this effort. By a full court press, so to speak, we have restored the drug czar's office.

In fact, I checked today and we funded over 150 positions. If you are going to fight a war on drugs, you have to have the ammunition, you have to have the equipment. You cannot cut the staff out of the leadership from 120 to 20.

Barry McCaffrey, our drug czar, I will say has done an admirable job in taking up this responsibility. And he not only has to have the responsibility, but he has to have the support of the Congress; and the support was not there. We see the results again in the lifetime

drug use. And it is just not coincidence. These are facts.

If we look at the long-term trend in lifetime of prevalence of cocaine, we see the same thing. We see during the Reagan administration, and I was a staffer in the United States Senate in those early days, I remember helping work with Senator Hawkins and others of the Reagan administration, the Republicans at that period of time controlled the administration and also the U.S. Senate, and we were able and we had support, I remember even the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL) and some of the Democrats on the other side help, and we turned around this situation with cocaine.

If you look, it goes back down to President Bush. Incredible declines in the prevalence of cocaine use through the Bush administration. And then, with "just say maybe," with lack of Federal leadership, with lack of executive direction, the cocaine use takes off again under President Clinton.

These are very dramatic charts showing exactly what happened. The information is not something the Republicans have just developed or our staff just put together. These are all from solid reports. This chart should be quite startling to everyone because it shows the latest drug of choice, and it is doing so much destruction not only in my community but also the land.

□ 2000

This shows again during the Reagan administration it sort of leveled out and the Bush administration, the prevalence of heroin use. We do see some decline in the Bush years, and then we see in the Clinton years it taking off like a rocket. And then when the Republicans took over again and we re-instituted a multifaceted, as I said, a full-court press against illegal narcotics, we have seen the beginning of a turnaround.

You cannot take the critical elements out of a war on drugs, just like any war that you fight. You cannot just be treating those wounded in battle. Interestingly enough, and we have the statistics on this, but from 1993 when the other side took control of the Congress and they controlled the White House, since then we have about doubled the amount of money on treatment. There is nothing wrong with spending money on treatment so long as those treatment programs are effective. But they must be effective and they must work. They must not be a revolving door. But we have doubled the money. In fact, with the Republican leadership just since we have taken over, there has been a 26 percent increase in funding from this Congress, Republican-controlled Congress, in treatment funding.

Tonight, I want to talk again about the budget battle. We are engaged in the House and the Senate with the administration in a very serious and difficult budget battle. We must pass 13 appropriations measures to fund all the

operations of government. We have passed some seven or eight of those and some of those have been vetoed by the President. The President I believe yesterday signed into law the Defense bill. That is sort of a no-brainer. It had pay raises for our military that is long overdue. Depletion of the military, we have restored funds. It has really one of the few increases, but again we have to remember that this administration that detests the military has used the military in more deployments than ever in the history of any administration that has existed. There is great cost and to that cost we must have responsibility. It is also a big agency and there is an opportunity for improving payment patterns and expenditures and cutting waste and inefficiency out of it. We are trying to do that. In fact, we are trying to do that in all of these bills. But again Defense is sort of a no-brainer.

One of the other bills that the President has vetoed is the District of Columbia appropriations bill. One of the 13 bills that we pass to fund our Federal Government, we also pass to support the District of Columbia, and that is a constitutional responsibility set out from the very beginning when we created the District in 1790, we have had that responsibility, but I think that bill is sort of a microcosm of what we are facing in the larger picture, how the Republicans inherited sort of a mess, an incredible mess, trust funds that were robbed, Social Security funds that were depleted, unfunded pensions, pension accounts; just numerous inefficiencies, programs that had been expanded. We had 760 Federal education programs, 200 job training programs, hundreds and hundreds of programs and built incredible bureaucracies in Washington. In fact, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Civil Service, I think there are somewhere in the neighborhood of a quarter of a million Federal civil servants just within 50 miles of where I am speaking around Washington. They had built this huge bureaucracy that had sort of spun out of control and in the process to fund this and also to keep power, in order to keep power you have to keep getting more people hooked on the Federal take, so to speak, and I am not speaking about just Federal employees. There are thousands of them that do a great job. I was chairman of Civil Service for 4 years. There are some great Federal employees out there. Many of them are hampered by the laws and regulations which the majority put into place and they could do a better job if we let them more effectively operate.

The District of Columbia is a great example of government gone wrong. What the folks on the other side who had 40 years to straighten out the District of Columbia, 40 years to make changes in programs, 40 years to bring the government of the District under control and the government of the United States, what they did and now

what the President is threatening to do, the President is threatening to veto again, and we have already had one veto on the District appropriations bill, but part of the discussion is, one, we are not spending enough money, the other is that we have not adopted liberal enough policies.

How do I get into this mix? I am chairman of the drug policy subcommittee but also an observer of the District and of what has gone on here, both before we came into power and after we came into power. But the same liberal policies that they are trying to adopt now, spend more and then adopt a more liberal drug policy, are exactly what got the District into difficulty. We have been able to bring the District out of some of that difficulty.

We have done the same thing with the District we have done for the country at large. Now, stop and think about this. Think about the District of Columbia in 1995 when we inherited the District of Columbia. The other side ruled it for 40 years, again very tight rule, specific rule, giving them everything they want. There was a \$722 million deficit just in 1995 in running the District of Columbia. It was just like the Federal Government. We were running 200 and \$300 billion deficits annually in addition to taking all the money out of the Social Security trust fund. They were taking all that money, then spending beyond that a couple of hundred billion more. They had run the District into indebtedness and reliance on the Federal taxpayers' largesse to the tune of three-quarters of a billion dollars a year. They had 40 years. In just over 4 years we have gotten their finances straightened out.

The first thing we had to do was basically take over the District, put in a control board and get some personnel who could do something. I want to cite again what we inherited here and talk about the policy that they are trying now to foster and the President is trying to impose with these vetoes.

The District of Columbia had, in 1995, 48,000 people employed in the District. It was the third in size as far as municipal employees, exceeded only by New York and Los Angeles. The revenue from all sources in 1995 was over \$7,200 per capita. They had plenty of money coming in. In fact, it was the highest in the United States. When we took over, they were charging more. The expenditures per capita, \$7,150, you guessed it, was the highest rate of expenditures in the country. So they had more employees than anyplace except for the two largest cities and on a per capita basis probably exceeded only by the former Soviet Union. The debt was the third highest in the United States at \$6,354 per person. That is what we inherited. Again, three-quarters of a billion dollars running annual deficit.

Let me tell you what else we inherited, and this is from the folks who are now saying they are going to straighten out Social Security and the District of Columbia. Let me talk about a few

of the programs that are important to people, and they always give you this baloney that the Democrats or the liberals are more interested in people than the Republicans or the conservative side of the aisle. This is what they did to the people that they are supposed to care about.

According to, and these are all articles except for one of these, it is from the Washington Post, not exactly a conservative publication but we will use the Post as a source. According to the Post in 1995, the Department of Housing and Urban Development rating system, the District's subsidized housing program achieved the lowest ranking of any urban public housing agency in the Nation. Now, that is an accomplishment. They had control of this place, control of the District and the housing program basically failed.

The prison. This is from 1995, again, the same story. "Authorities have uncovered a multimillion-dollar heroin ring that was run out of the Lorton correctional complex. That is the D.C. prison. Prosecutors have obtained convictions on more than 30 corrections employees in the past 3 years for smuggling drugs, accepting bribes and corruption. A jail suicide expert recently described the D.C. jail situation as catastrophic." This is what we inherited in 1995, the new majority. We have had to basically take the Federal prison, take the housing authority and revamp all of these programs, practically eliminate the prison here because the prisoners had basically taken over control.

Now, again these are supposed to be the most compassionate people, they tell you how they are saving Social Security and children and they always line up the children in the photo ops and all of that. This is what they were doing with the children, again their liberal, failed policies. This is from the Washington Post. The article is right here. I will read right from it:

"Some mentally ill children at the District's St. Elizabeth Hospital have been fed little more than rice, jello and chicken for the last month after some suppliers refused to make deliveries because they hadn't been paid."

Here those that are probably the least well off, least able to help themselves, the mentally ill children in the District, they were the recipients of their policy, and again this is something that we have had to straighten out in the last little more than 4 years. They had 40 years to create this mess. And now they want to go back to that.

This is a great story from the Washington Post, October 7, 1994:

A city funded program aimed at spurring economic development has made few loans, created few jobs and after 6 years is still sitting on millions of dollars, according to the D.C. auditor Russell Smith. Smith said the Economic Development Finance Corporation, which began operating in 1988, again under these folks, has failed in its mission. He contended that it has improp-

erly invested \$6 million in a private for-profit group and furthermore that again their programs were a failure. Finally, the report criticized this group, the economic development group, for improper expenses, including food, flowers and political contributions made. This is what the other side did when they controlled the District of Columbia.

One of the other areas I spoke a little bit about and I think is important to all of those who do not have housing, is public housing. The other side claims to be able to do more for folks. But again in February 1993, the Washington Post reported about the housing project, again under their watch:

"Fraught with contracting delays, staffing problems and an endless crush of maintenance requests, the city's housing department still has 1,895 units boarded up and unfit for anyone, not the record number of families in shelters for the homeless, not the 11,000 people waiting on average of 5 years for public housing."

And then in their drug and alcohol treatment programs, trying to help those who we want to help and who we are now trying to help with our programs and policies that are incorporated in the legislation that the President has vetoed for the District.

This is 1993 again. "Its drug and alcohol treatment programs, however, were denounced as inadequate last month by Federal officials. However, the city has also gone without a permanent mental health commissioner for the past year. Its public housing department is being sued for failing to fix apartments and its Department of Human Services, responsible for tackling most of the social problems affecting the city, is still bound by 16 court orders to improve its work."

Now, this is what they did in 40 years and we inherited, and in a little over 4 years we have begun to straighten out this mess, but the President does not want to see that continued. He wants more spending, more liberal programs.

□ 2015

Public housing, the situation was horrible. I remember seeing a television report with rats and infestations you would not put, as I said on the floor of the House in a previous speech, your dog in one of these units, public housing units, that were under the control and supervision of these folks here.

Again, a question of a liberal policy, a conservative policy.

Then the question of pensions, and the previous speaker to me was talking about the Republicans and how they are not good custodians of Social Security.

Now my colleagues have to remember that in 1993, 1994, 1995 and before that, they were spending 200 to \$300 billion a year in excess of the revenues coming in and then all the money in the Social Security Trust Fund.

This particular chart tells it all. It shows Democrat control, spending from

the Social Security Trust Fund. Democrat control, 1984, 1985, right in this period when they took over the House and the Senate, and the Congress controls the spending, folks. The President can recommend it or veto some, but basically the authority under the Constitution is with the House of Representatives and the Senate.

This is the most graphic and telling chart that I have ever seen. Every American should look at this.

And how they can come to the floor with a face and tell us that we are not doing a good job, we are not good stewards of this, or we are proposing plans to spend from the trust fund. When you see what they did when they controlled this, they spent all the money that came in, all of that into indebtedness, and then all of the trust fund money. It is absolutely astounding that they could come with straight faces, come to the floor and accuse us of this.

They also distorted, and I heard, again, previous speakers talking about this, about Republicans wanted to do away with Social Security. Well, I do not know of any Republican who has advocated doing away with Social Security. Most of us are concerned because of their years and years of spending out of the trust fund. It is very difficult to put it back put the money back in there, and we are doing that for the first time. Without a doubt we are doing it.

But it is beyond belief that, again, they could come to the floor with a straight face and say that we have a plan to do this.

Now I cite this because they did the same thing with the District of Columbia when Marion Berry in 1994 was here, and this is from the Washington Times, the only one I have from the Washington Times. But I think the facts are correct in it. It says Marion Berry has proposed little beyond the \$140 million mandate to shore up the city's sagging finances. With a \$40 million deficit remaining from fiscal 1994, an \$18 million shortage in payments to Metro, 5 billion in unfunded police and firefighters' pension liability; not only did they do it to the Social Security Trust Fund, they did it to the District's pension funds.

And again I just do not know how you can dispute the facts. This chart has not been doctored in any way. This tells it like it is. In fact, the other side had their chance some 40 years and a little more than 4 years. It is absolutely incredible what we have been able to do in fighting and kicking and screaming with the President vetoing our legislation, even the District bill.

Again, if you take what the Democrats did with education, and you hear them talk about how they have done so much with education. In fact, my wife was a former educator. Myself, I graduated from the University of Florida with a degree from the College of Education. Though I never professionally taught, Mr. Speaker, I am an observer of what has taken place in education,

both again living with a teacher and closely monitoring what has happened.

What they have adopted as their policy for public education is what I call RAD. It is called regulate, administer and dictate, RAD; R-A-D, regulate, administer and dictate. And that is what they have done over 40 years, bringing more control and power.

Now what is interesting, only between 4 and 5 cents of every dollar that goes into education in fact comes from the Federal level; 95-96 cents comes from State and local sources. But year after year they have created more federal programs; I told you some 760; I think we have it down to a little below 700 now kicking and screaming, but consolidating some of the administration, the A in that, the regulations. They want to regulate and control. As long as they regulate and control, administer programs, decide who gets the grant, who gets this, we have said that we want 90 percent of the money in the classroom and for basic education. They, in fact, have had 90 percent of the money not going into the classroom and for education. They want to determine whether we use the money for school construction, or they want to determine the hiring and firing of teachers. We think that should be left to the local school boards and local officials.

It is a liberal philosophy, a liberal philosophy of RAD. Regulate from Washington, administer from Washington, and dictate from Washington.

Now they did the same thing with the District of Columbia, and what did we inherit in the District? We basically inherited a school system where they are spending more per student than almost any place in the United States and getting less, some of the worst performance records.

In an article in 1996, again of what we inherited, the D.C. public school system had 91 leaky roofs, currently they had 20 condemned boilers and a hundred of 230 buses are nonoperational. This is what we inherited, and, again, straightening this out has been very difficult, and again the President wants to veto our approach to education in the District, our approach to drug policy in the District, our approach to fiscal responsibility in the District and go back to the reckless ways of spending.

I love these articles because they cite again what we inherited, what this new Republican majority inherited, and I think every Republican should be proud whether it is the American who is out there and registered as a Republican, whether it is a Republican in this Congress, whether it is some of my colleagues who were beaten up and defeated for the fiscal responsibility that they brought about, but I think they should be very proud of what they have done not only in the Congress for the country, but I think what we have done for our Nation's capital.

A nation's capital should be a shining example. Instead it was a disgraceful situation here that we inherited.

This 1996 Washington Post article talks about what we inherited with some of the medical facilities; in this case, the morgue, and I have cited this one before. This is just unbelievable:

Cockroaches crawling across stainless steel autopsy tables, clogged drains that often send blood and body fluid spilling on to the faded tile floor, flies droning in the hot stench, so thick it sticks to your skin and leaves fowl taste in your mouth. And here is a quote from one of the workers there:

We try to do the autopsies early in the morning, it is cooler then.

This was the scene yesterday at the District's dilapidated morgue near the D.C. General Hospital in southeast Washington where 74 corpses, more than three times the morgue's intended capacity, are being stored in a facility where refrigeration sometimes cuts off when it rains.

This is the mess that we inherited with the District of Columbia. This is the way they operated it and administered it, a very important fiduciary responsibility in the Constitution. The Congress is responsible for the District.

It gets even worse. It says one body, and this is the report from this reporter, Washington Post, who looked at it then. One body was on the floor, and some were in body bags that had split open exposing the faces of the corpses. The backlog has occurred in parts because the crematorium the morgue uses to dispose of unclaimed bodies broke down a month ago, and the cash-strapped city had no other way to dispose of the corpses.

This is a part of this argument, and, as my colleagues know, I have said before it was easy for us to balance the budget because what we did is we limited the increases. They have you think that we took food out of the mouths of babies, we closed down social programs. The argument we got into was limiting the increases in spending. They had huge 10, 12, 14 percent, not mentioning the giveaway programs of the District. Seven hundred and twenty-two million, three-quarters of a billion in 1 year, to pay for this mess.

This is what we inherited; it is a disgrace. Can people not deal with these facts? I know this has to be embarrassing for the other side, but this, in fact, is what our majority inherited, what we have been able in a little more than 4 years to straighten out situations like this.

Then, again, we talk about caring for those who are in most need. I talked about the mentally ill children feeding them Jello and rice for months. That is the compassionate liberal solution.

Here, and I used this one last week, I will cite it again: neglected and abused children. Now what can be more responsible than taking care of neglected and abused children?

Here is a worker, a welfare specialist who came in from Guam, and said she saw some very difficult situations in Guam. This is in 1995. But after 6

months in the District's bureaucratic trenches she knows she made a terrible mistake. This is quoting from the article. She quit Friday saddened and shocked, she says, by a foster care system so bad that it actually compounds the problems of the neglected children and their families, and she said and then to come here and see one of the worst situations, it is depressing. She quit in 1995.

This is what we inherited. This is how the so-called compassionate liberals are taking care, custodians of the Nation's capital, spending huge amounts. We have gotten that into balance. We have to take it over, and we are getting these programs into order. The difficult part is getting these programs into order. But this is the disgusting and irresponsible mess that we inherited.

The trauma center, the hospitals. Basically the hospitals were defunct in the District. March 1995, another Washington Post article: Impending cut-backs at D.C. General Hospital make it apparently inevitable that Washington's only public hospital will close its trauma center. This is the busiest center in the city, and the D.C. General Hospital is the only hospital equipped to treat gun shot, stabbing and other major injuries on the city's eastern side which has the most violence and the greatest number of uninsured patients.

1995, March; this is the story. This is what we inherited.

Now, again remember \$722 million supplement; in other words, they are running that debt, the taxpayers of the whole country were funding this mess. This is part of what the argument about is with the President of the United States. He vetoed our legislation which is responsible legislation. We brought the District into an administrative order. The 48,000 employees, down to some 33,000, and it should be cut even more; kicking and screaming, they came, and they picketed us, and they boycotted our offices. They kicked and screamed and yelled, but that had to be done to bring the administration, to bring the finances of the District into order.

Again, we face a veto by the president of the United States over what has been proposed as far as getting the District's house in order and as far as liberal versus conservative policies.

□ 2030

I could go on. We have even more stories about what we inherited in the District of Columbia and the battle, the budget battle that is now being fought. I guess the latest strategy from our side is to incorporate in the Health and Human Services appropriations measure the District bill and the President will veto that again.

But do we want to go back to where they had the District of Columbia? Do we want to go to where they had the people of the United States facing incredible deficits and the robbing of

trust funds and taking the money from Social Security funds? I say no.

But the proposal before the Congress and the President also deals, and I want to talk specifically about that here, with whether or not to adopt liberal drug policies for the District in addition to liberal spending policies. Liberal drug policies in the bill are manifested in a prohibition of using Federal money on needle exchanges, for one matter, and the other side says give them free needles and they will not get HIV.

In fact, our subcommittee, I chair this Subcommittee on Criminal Justice, Drug Policy and Human Resources and our staff looked into some of the needle exchange programs, not only in the United States but around the world.

One of the first needle exchange programs was in Australia, and we have a report here, a 1997 report, that said free distribution of needles for injections of illicit drugs was introduced in Australia in the late 80's on the hypothesis it would play an important role in prevention of HIV transmission. Free needle distribution and exchange began officially in Sydney, where both HIV infection and IV drug use are concentrated, with a trial program in 1987.

Then a report was done in 1997 in Australia, and it said it specifically provides no evidence, let me read from it, "it provides no evidence to support the importance of free needle or needle exchange programs and much is to indicate irrelevance to HIV infection in Australia." This study also goes on to cite several other areas, and I have also cited the Vancouver study, which also showed that this needle exchange program actually can have an opposite effect.

But that is what the President of the United States, that is what the liberal side of the aisle would like to impose, is a needle exchange program, federally funded by all the taxpayers, on the premise that, again, it cuts down on HIV transmission. The facts are to the contrary, the studies are to the contrary, a liberal policy versus a conservative policy.

Now, Baltimore really is the premier city that has had a liberal policy. Baltimore is a liberal jurisdiction policy and has had needle exchange. I like to use Baltimore as an example because Baltimore, which adopted a legal needle exchange program, has actually dramatically increased its heroin addicts. In 1996 they went to almost 39,000, according to this chart provided by DEA. In 1998, they were over 56,000, according to DEA. The gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS) has told me he estimates it to be 60,000 drug addicts.

In fact, from Time Magazine, this liberal policy, again which the President would like to have us adopt and the other side would like to have us adopt, this is from Time Magazine just a few weeks ago, not my quote, it is a quote of one of their officials, "One of every

10 citizens is a drug addict. Government officials dispute the last claim. It is more like 1 in 8, says veteran City Councilwoman Rikki Spector. We probably lost count." Again, not my words, a Time Magazine report. A liberal policy.

If you look at what we have done, again, one of the things I am most proud of is we have taken a tougher stance in Washington the last four years, and the murder rate in Washington has decreased 14 percent from 1997 to 1998. We are down to 260 murders. It was in the 400-plus range when I came here. Every night young African Americans were being slaughtered on the streets. This is still not acceptable, but there has been a decrease through a more conservative oversight by, again, I think this Republican Policy Committee and the types of policy we want in the bill that we presented to the President, which he has vetoed.

The same thing has happened with New York. The murder rate decreased there 17 percent in 1997 to 1998. In fact, in Baltimore, the deaths in 1997-1998, this liberal drug policy, it is actually one of the few jurisdictions where they have stayed the same. In fact, they are exactly the same, 312 in 1997 and 312 in 1998.

This is the liberal policy that the President wants to adopt relating to drug programs and to approaches as far as legislative oversight and as far as spending. So we can see factually what happens. You get a dramatic increase in the number of addicts.

The contrary is true, and I have held this job up in New York City under the leadership and conservative zero tolerance approach of Mayor Giuliani, went from over 2,000 murders down to 629 murders. New York, I am not sure what the population of New York is, but it has to be 9 or 10 million people, at least. Baltimore has about 500,000, 600,000 population now, and it has 312 murders, about half the number. That must be 10 or 15 times the murder rate. A conservative approach of Mayor Rudy Giuliani, who has dramatically cut 70 percent of the deaths in New York City.

So we have a choice. We have a choice between a liberal policy and we have a choice between a conservative approach.

Mr. Speaker, with only 3 minutes remaining, I have spoken mostly tonight again on the situation we find ourselves in, but, you know, it is sad, because the District of Columbia has some wonderful people. They go to work and they try to make a living. There are families here, there are single parents here, there are so many good Americans in the District of Columbia, and we do have an important responsibility over the District of Columbia.

But we tried their way. The jails failed, the prisons were destroyed. The public housing was a disgrace. The programs for the mentally ill, the children

in most need, the neglected, the education programs, they all failed. Fortunately, that entire model was not transposed on the country.

The pension fund, just as I pointed out, the pension fund of the District was even taken from, just as Social Security.

I will hold this up as I close, because it is important, not only this one bill for the District of Columbia. Many people in America, many Members of Congress, may or may not care about the District specifically. We are very much, particularly in the House, oriented towards the problems of our own District. But it is a Federal responsibility. These are decent human beings.

But should we return to the chaos that they created in 40 years? After some four years-plus of hard work and effort to put money back in the trust fund, to make the District of Columbia something you can be proud of, that people can live and work here, and it is our Nation's Capital, it should be a shining example, and those trust funds should be really part of our trust. That is why the people of America sent us here, for trust, to make sure these programs operate.

So I hope that the American people will read between the lines. I hope that the President will not continue to insist on these vetoes, to bring more liberal policies on needle exchange and other drug legalization schemes, and then have the fiscal responsibility that is so important. It is tough. It is tough being a Member of Congress today because we do want to do the right thing, particularly on our side.

TRIBUTE TO THE LATE HONORABLE JULIUS NYERERE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, it is indeed a sad night tonight, because we will be talking about the loss of a great leader from the country of Tanzania, the former President, Julius Nyerere, who passed away last week in London at the age of 77 years of age.

One of the reasons that we mourn this loss and that we rise today to pay tribute to this great man, a great statesman, a great man of compassion, a great educator, a person with tremendous vision, is because he was a person who believed strongly in Africa's ability to forge a prosperous future through unity and peace.

At the time that Julius Nyerere moved towards his tenure as president, he was a person who had a tremendous belief in education. He was known affectionately throughout Africa as Mwalimu, which means "teacher" in Swahili.

My first trip to Tanzania was back in 1973 when I had the opportunity to travel to that country with a YMCA statesmanship group that was a pro-

gram run by the International Division of the YMCA, at that time Mr. Frank Keeny and persons like Dr. Nicholas Ganteroff and many of the leaders, the late Bob Harlan, who was the CEO of the YMCAs of the USA, a great man of vision. We had the opportunity to travel to Tanzania, and at that time President Nyerere was the leader of that country.

The thing that struck me was that they had what they called education for self-reliance. Education for self-reliance was an educational system that brought the youngsters in about 8 in the morning, and then at noon they broke for 2 hours of work in the fields and they were learning how to be farmers, how to be self-reliant. Following that they would have a late lunch and then go back to class until close to 6 o'clock.

I had the opportunity to visit some of the classrooms, dirt floors, thatched roofs, walls made out of mud, and youngsters in the third and fourth grade were studying algebra, looking at basic trigonometry, speaking at least three to four languages, always Swahili. Everyone spoke English. They learned their local dialect. And I was very, very impressed and started to just study this whole education for self-reliance.

We had the opportunity to visit even in the more rural areas, and President Nyerere insisted that everyone must participate. He believed in the "Ujama" concept. That is the concept of collectivism, that everyone had to produce, everyone had to be a part of the growth and the development of their country.

Tanzania is one of the poorest countries in the world. The beautiful mountain Kilimanjaro is in Tanzania. But the educational system was almost second-to-none in that region of the world. He was a person that brought Tanzania out of the shadows of colonial rule and into independence.

□ 2045

Many of the leaders in Africa used to visit and stay in Tanzania in Dar es Salaam where they used to talk about the Pan-Africanism and the question of independence in their countries, the leaders from Namibia to SWAPO organization, the ANC, the South African organization led by Mr. Nelson Mandela, of course, in prison at that time with Mr. Mbeki and other leaders that we grew to know, Mr. Sisulu. These were ANC leaders who were also in prison, but their colleagues found themselves in Dar es Salaam.

We had leaders from Zambia, at that time Rhodesia. It was northern Rhodesia and Southern Rhodesia, which is now Zimbabwe. But people like Mr. Mugabe, Joshua Nkomo, these great leaders used to migrate down to Dar es Salaam and talk about revolution, talk about independence, talk about freedom, talk about self-reliance.

So we saw the whole area of independence led by our fallen leader who,

at the age of 77, died after losing a 2-year battle with leukemia. He was a person who was the first leader to voluntarily step down. Elected in 1962, he decided that he would step down after serving 23 years as president. His people wanted him to continue on. But he said, no, he would not continue on as president, and he stepped down. Elections were held. President Benjamin Mkapa was the one who then became head of Tanzania recently.

It was interesting that, in his drive for independence, the East African countries were under the British rule. They had Uganda, Kenya, and Tanzania. An organization called the East African Federation was created by the British. They integrated the air links, the rail links, the road links.

The break-up of the East African Confederation happened when the countries became independent. It was Jomo Kenyatta who led the Mau Mau who really started the whole move to independence, and Kenya was in the lead, although they were not the first. Gada received their independence in 1958, Kenya not until the early 1960s, although Sudan received their independence in 1957, 1956. So we saw, though, President Nyerere taking this country forward.

There was a mean brutal dictator from the bordering country of Uganda. During my travels in Uganda in 1973 and 1974, I was in the presence of the then dictator Idi Amin. Idi Amin was a person who turned on his people.

Idi Amin came to power by defeating President Milton Obote who served as the first president of Uganda but was not serving the people well. Idi Amin, at that time a popular figure with the people of Abu Gandon, took over, by military coups, and ousted Milton Obote. But then Idi Amin tended to turn on his people. Actually, then, with the incident in Entebbe where Israel came in to take out its citizens, that is when Idi Amin totally turned very barbaric on his people, murdering them and killing them and maiming them.

The Organization of African Unity at that time had a protocol that one nation did not interfere with another nation's problems, that although they despise Idi Amin, they said that they would not become involved in another country's problem. That was one of their founding protocols.

But this was wrong, said President Nyerere. In 1979, in defiance to the Organization of African Unity, President Nyerere sent troops to Uganda in response to this intense suffering of Ugandan people under the brutal dictatorship of Idi Amin.

That operation, one of the first humanitarian missions of its kind in Africa, would help set up a legal precedent for peacekeeping missions all over the world as we see today as a common thing, as we see in East Timor, as we see being created for Kosovo, as we hear about the discussion in Sierra Leone, as we have seen in Cambodia in the past.